UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,469	04/06/2005	Christian Schmaranzer	SCHMARANZER ET AL - 1 PCT	4891

25889 7590 02/04/2009

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD
ROSLYN, NY 11576

EXAMINER	
ABOAGYE, MICHAEL	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1793	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/530,469	SCHMARANZER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MICHAEL ABOAGYE	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *2,3,5 and 7-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *2, 3, 5 and 7- 10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 17, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2,3,5,7,8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the joined sheet blanks" in the last line

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the thickness" in the last line.

There are insufficient antecedent basis for these limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793).

Regarding claim 8, Bertels teaches a method of joining a sheet of aluminum material (21, figures 4-5b) to a sheet of iron/steel material (16, figures 4-5b), comprising the steps of providing the sheet of iron/steel material at least in a joining region with a coating containing zinc (18, figures 4-5b), joining the sheets in a butt-joint, "and applying a filler on a basis of aluminum (column 1, lines 10-22) in a region bridging the butt-joint on both surfaces of the sheets and melting the filler to form a seam consisting of a welding connection with the aluminum material sheet and a soldering connection with the iron or titanium material sheet (column 1, lines 10-38 and column 3, lines 28-37). Bertels is not very particular about comparing the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet with the sheet thickness, however he teaches a length of a connection seam (35, figure 7) of about 8 mm and steel plate thickness of about 2 mm, therefore the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, is about 4 mm (8÷2) which amounts to about 2 times the thickness of the iron/steel sheet (also see, column 4, lines 35-52).

Though Bertels does not teach the exact ratio between the claimed connection and the thickness of the iron sheet, however it has been held that, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but

are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), See MPEP 2144.05

Regarding claim 2 Bertels teaches the iron/steel sheet (16, figure 5a) having a chamfered portion abutting with the aluminum sheet (21, figure 5a). Furthermore same analysis as in figure 7 of Bertels is relied upon; wherein a length of a connection seam (35, figure 7) of about 8 mm and steel plate thickness of about 2 mm, therefore the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, is about 4 mm (8÷2) which amounts to about 2 times the thickness of the iron/steel sheet (also see, column 4, lines 35-52).

Though Bertels does not teach the exact ratio between the claimed connection and the thickness of the iron sheet, however it has been held that, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), See MPEP 2144.05

Regarding claim 9, Bertels teaches wherein the sheets are butt-joined with one of the surfaces of the sheets lying in a common plane (see, figures 4-5b). The limitation calling for "after the seam has been formed, the sheets are bent away from the common plane in the joining region" is noted however said limitation does note set forth any method steps for achieving said configuration. The examiner therefore interprets the

bending of the sheet 32 and 31 after the seam has been formed shown in figures 6 and 8 of Bertels to meet said claimed limitation.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) as applied in claim 8 above and further in view of Persson (US Patent No. 2,719,900).

Bertels as above teaches cold forming the joined sheet but does not expressly teach the step of flattening by plastic deformation after the application of the filler.

However Persson teaches a welding process, forming a weld bead or seam, wherein the weld bead or seam is deformed plastically or flattened by the application of a roller thereby consolidating the weldment (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to have modified the method of Bertels with the application of a roller to plastically deform the weld seam as taught by Persson in order to consolidate the weld seam which by so doing will enhance the strength of the butt joint (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) as applied to claim 8 above and further in view of Kunz et al. US Patent No. 6,478,886).

Bertels fails to teach covering the sheets with a corrosion protection layer on at least one side of the sheets in the transitional region to the coated iron material sheet.

However Kunz et al. teaches zinc coating plus corrosion protection layer made of lacquer used on construction parts made of steel and aluminum parts to prevent contact corrosion a resulting from top- coat damage (i.e. zinc coating), (see Kunz et al. column 3, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to modify the method of Bertels to supplement the zinc coating on the iron potion of the butt joint with a lacquer as taught by Kunz et al. in order to prevent contact corrosion at the butt joint if the top coat (i.e. zinc) is damaged (see Kunz et al. column 3, lines 18-26).

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) as applied in claim 8 above and further in view of Persson (US Patent No. 2,719,900) and Frings et al. (US Patent No. 4,827,100).

Bertels does not teach the step of flattening the seam. Bertels mentions a step of drawing or deforming the butt welded sheets accompanying the butt welding step (see, column 1, lines 43-46) but said teaching falls short of cold forming of the joined sheet blanks.

However Persson teaches a welding process, forming a weld bead or seam, wherein the weld bead or seam is deformed plastically or flattened by the application of a roller thereby consolidating the weldment (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to have modified the methods of Bertels with the

application of a roller to plastically deform the weld seam as taught by Persson in order to consolidate the weld seam which by so doing will enhance the strength of the butt joint (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

Frings et al. teaches butt welding two similar or dissimilar material sheets (37,38, figure5) to form a composite sheet and converting said composite sheet into a shaped member by pressing or deep drawing or cold forming (Frings et al., abstract and column1, line 56-column 2, line 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the combined invention of Bertels and Persson to accompany the butt welding step with a cold forming or shaping step as taught by Frings et al. since the subsequent shaping step yields readily marketable product or yield parts of greater economic value (Frings et al., column 1, lines 49-67).

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) in view of Frings et al. (US Patent No. 4,827,100). Bertels teaches a method of joining a sheet of aluminum material (21, figures 4-5b) to a sheet of iron/steel material (16, figures 4-5b), comprising the steps of providing the sheet of iron/steel material at least in a joining region with a coating containing zinc (18, figures 4-5b), joining the sheets in a butt-joint, "and applying a filler on a basis of aluminum (column 1, lines 10-22) in a region bridging the butt-joint on both surfaces of the sheets and melting the filler to form a seam consisting of a welding connection with the aluminum material sheet and a soldering connection with the iron or titanium

material sheet (column 1, lines 10-38 and column 3, lines 28-37). Bertels is not very particular about comparing the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, however he teaches a length of a connection seam (35, figure 7) of about 8 mm and steel plate thickness of about 2 mm, therefore the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, is about 4 mm (8÷2) which amounts to about 2 times the thickness of the iron/steel sheet (also see, column 4, lines 35-52).

Though Bertels does not teach the exact ratio between the claimed connection and the thickness of the iron sheet, however it has been held that, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), See MPEP 2144.05

Bertels mentions a step of drawing or deforming the butt welded sheets accompanying the butt welding step (see, column 1, lines 43-46) but said teaching falls short of cold forming of joined sheet blanks.

Frings et al. teaches butt welding two similar or dissimilar material sheets (37,38, figure5) to form a composite sheet and converting said composite sheet into a shaped member by pressing or deep drawing or cold forming (Frings et al., abstract and column1, line 56-column 2, line 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the invention of Bertels to accompany the butt

welding step with a cold forming or shaping step as taught by Frings et al. since the subsequent shaping yield readily marketable product or yield parts of greater economic value (Frings et al., column 1, lines 49-67).

10. Claims 2, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) in view of Lorcher et al. (US Patent No. 3,655,017).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Bertels teaches a method of joining a sheet of aluminum material (21, figures 4-5b) to a sheet of iron/steel material (16, figures 4-5b), comprising the steps of providing the sheet of iron/steel material at least in a joining region with a coating containing zinc (18, figures 4-5b), joining the sheets in a butt-joint, "and applying a filler on a basis of aluminum (column 1, lines 10-22) in a region bridging the butt-joint on both surfaces of the sheets and melting the filler to form a seam consisting of a welding connection with the aluminum material sheet and a soldering connection with the iron or titanium material sheet (column 1, lines 10-38 and column 3, lines 28-37). Bertels is not very particular about comparing the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet to the sheet thickness, however he teaches a length of a connection seam (35, figure 7) of about 8 mm and steel plate thickness of about 2 mm, therefore the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, is

about 4 mm (8÷2) which amounts to about 2 times the thickness of the iron/steel sheet (also see, column 4, lines 35-52).

Bertels fails to teach the exact ratio between the claimed connection and the thickness of the iron sheet as claimed.

Lorcher et al. teaches as known in the art to achieve a greater or an enhanced weld joint strength when the joint width is at least four times the thickness of a sheet to be joined (Lorcher et al., column 1, lines 62-72). Though Lorcher et al. recites joint width as opposed to joint length recited in the claims 2 and 8, however, the terms joint width or joint length can be relative depending on how one views the dimensions or the configuration of the joint. It should also be pointed out that said joint width and joint length have been used interchangeable in the Applicant's drawing and specification.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the invention of Bertels to make the joint width at least four times the thickness of a sheet as taught by Lorcher et al. in order to achieve an enhance joint strength (Lorcher et al., column 1, lines 62-72).

Regarding claim 9, Bertels teaches wherein the sheets are butt-joined with one of the surfaces of the sheets lying in a common plane (see, figures 4-5b). The limitation calling for "after the seam has been formed, the sheets are bent away from the common plane in the joining region" is noted however said limitation does note set forth any method steps for achieving said configuration. The examiner therefore interprets the bending of the sheet 32 and 31 after the seam has been formed shown in figures 6 and 8 of Bertels to meet said claimed limitation.

11. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) in view of Lorcher et al. (US Patent No. 3,655,017) as applied in claim 8 above and further in view of Persson (US Patent No. 2,719,900).

The combination of Bertels and Lorcher et al. teach cold forming the joined sheet but does not expressly teach the step of flattening by plastic deformation after the application of the filler.

However Persson teaches a welding process, forming a weld bead or seam, wherein the weld bead or seam is deformed plastically or flattened by the application of a roller thereby consolidating the weldment (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to have modified the combined method of Bertels and Lorcher et al. with the application of a roller to plastically deform the weld seam as taught by Persson in order to consolidate the weld seam which by so doing will enhance the strength of the butt joint (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) in view of Lorcher et al. (US Patent No. 3,655,017) as applied to claim 8 above and further in view of Kunz et al. US Patent No. 6,478,886).

The combination of Bertels and Lorcher et al. fail to teach covering the sheets with a corrosion protection layer on at least one side of the sheets in the transitional region to the coated iron material sheet.

However Kunz et al. teaches zinc coating plus corrosion protection layer made of lacquer used on construction parts made of steel and aluminum parts to prevent contact corrosion a resulting from top- coat damage (i.e. zinc coating), (see Kunz et al. column 3, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to modify the combined method of Bertels and Lorcher et al. to supplement the zinc coating on the iron potion of the butt joint with a lacquer as taught by Kunz et al. in order to prevent contact corrosion at the butt joint if the top coat (i.e. zinc) is damaged (see Kunz et al. column 3, lines 18-26).

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) in view of Lorcher et al. (US Patent No. 3,655,017) as applied in claim 8 above and further in view of Persson (US Patent No. 2,719,900) and Frings et al. (US Patent No. 4,827,100).

The combination of Bertels and Lorcher et al. do not teach the step of flattening the seam. Bertels mentions a step of drawing or deforming the butt welded sheets accompanying the butt welding step (see, column 1, lines 43-46) but said teaching falls short of cold forming of the joined sheet blanks.

However Persson teaches a welding process, forming a weld bead or seam, wherein the weld bead or seam is deformed plastically or flattened by the application of a roller thereby consolidating the weldment (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicants' invention was made to have modified the combined method of Bertels and Lorcher et al. with the application of a roller to plastically deform the weld seam as taught by Persson in order to consolidate the weld seam which by so doing will enhance the strength of the butt joint (see, Persson, column 2, lines 45-55).

Frings et al. teaches butt welding two similar or dissimilar material sheets (37,38, figure5) to form a composite sheet and converting said composite sheet into a shaped member by pressing or deep drawing or cold forming (Frings et al., abstract and column1, line 56-column 2, line 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the combined invention of Bertels and Lorcher et al. and Persson to accompany the butt welding step with a cold forming or shaping step as taught by Frings et al. since the subsequent shaping step yields readily marketable product or yield parts of greater economic value (Frings et al., column 1, lines 49-67).

14. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertels (US Patent No. 3,202,793) in view of Lorcher et al. (US Patent No. 3,655,017) and Frings et al. (US Patent No. 4,827,100).

Bertels teaches a method of joining a sheet of aluminum material (21, figures 4-5b) to a sheet of iron/steel material (16, figures 4-5b), comprising the steps of providing the sheet of iron/steel material at least in a joining region with a coating containing zinc

(18, figures 4-5b), joining the sheets in a butt-joint, "and applying a filler on a basis of aluminum (column 1, lines 10-22) in a region bridging the butt-joint on both surfaces of the sheets and melting the filler to form a seam consisting of a welding connection with the aluminum material sheet and a soldering connection with the iron or titanium material sheet (column 1, lines 10-38 and column 3, lines 28-37). Bertels is not very particular about comparing the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, however he teaches a length of a connection seam (35, figure 7) of about 8 mm and steel plate thickness of about 2 mm, therefore the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, is about 4 mm (8÷2) which amounts to about 2 times the thickness of the iron/steel sheet (also see, column 4, lines 35-52).

Bertels fails to teach the exact ratio between the claimed connection and the thickness of the iron sheet as claimed.

Lorcher et al. teaches as known in the art to achieve a greater or an enhanced weld joint strength when the joint width is at least four times the thickness of a sheet to be joined (Lorcher et al., column 1, lines 62-72). Though Lorcher et al. recites joint width as opposed to joint length recited in the claims 2 and 8, however, the terms joint width or joint length can be relative depending on how one views the dimensions or the configuration of the joint. It should also be pointed out that said joint width and joint length have been used interchangeable in the Applicant's drawing and specification.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the invention of Bertels to make the joint width

at least four times the thickness of a sheet as taught by Lorcher et al. in order to achieve an enhance joint strength (Lorcher et al., column 1, lines 62-72).

Bertels mentions a step of drawing or deforming the butt welded sheets accompanying the butt welding step (see, column 1, lines 43-46) but the combined teachings of Bertels and Lorcher et al. fall short of cold forming of joined sheet blanks.

Frings et al. teaches butt welding two similar or dissimilar material sheets (37,38, figure5) to form a composite sheet and converting said composite sheet into a shaped member by pressing or deep drawing or cold forming (Frings et al., abstract and column1, line 56-column 2, line 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify the combined invention of Bertels and Lorcher et al. to accompany the butt welding step with a cold forming or shaping step as taught by Frings et al. since the subsequent shaping yield readily marketable product or yield parts of greater economic value (Frings et al., column 1, lines 49-67).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed10/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant assert that claims 8 and 10 recite the lenqth of the soldering connection from the butt joint along the iron or titanium sheet is at least three times the thickness of

the sheet. That these features are not taught or suggested by Bertels. Also according to applicant's analysis of figure 7, the coverage width of the edge of the steel sheet 31 therefore corresponds to 1.5 times the thickness.

In response the examiner disagrees with applicant's analysis of figure 7. Bertels is not very particular about comparing the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, however he teaches a length of a connection seam (35, figure 7) of about 8 mm and steel plate thickness of about 2 mm, therefore the length of the soldering connection extending from the butt- joint and along the iron/steel sheet, is about 4 mm (8÷2) which amounts to about 2 times the thickness of the iron/steel sheet (also see, column 4, lines 35-52). Though Bertels does not teach the exact ratio between the claimed connection and the thickness of the iron sheet, however 2 times is considered by the examiner to substantially close to 3 times. Furthermore, it has been held that, a prima facie case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985), See MPEP 2144.05.

In addition Lorcher et al. teaches as known in the art to achieve a greater or an enhanced weld joint strength when the joint width is at least four times the thickness of a sheet to be joined (Lorcher et al., column 1, lines 62-72). Though Lorcher et al. recites joint width as opposed to joint length recited in the claims 2 and 8, however, the terms joint width or joint length can relative depending on how one views the dimensions or

the configuration of the joint. It should also be noted that Lorcher et al. relates at least a dimension of the joint to the thickness of at least a sheet to be joined to another in describing the joint strength. It is the examiner position that such teaching of Lorcher et al. is sufficient to meet the limitation represented as the core element in applicant's argument.

Applicant also argues that Bertels and Frings et al. together also cannot lead to the invention. Of course, it is not new to subject welded sheets to subsequent cold deformation that extends to the weld seam. However, it is surprising that the connection seam between an aluminum material and an iron material, according to the invention, allows subsequent cold deformation of the work piece without having to accept cracks in the region of the connection seam or impairments with regard to the deformation, resulting from the connection seam.

In response, it is noted that said argument is not commensurate with the claimed invention.

Applicant's argument regarding the reference to Webb, is moot since said is not applicable in the instant office action.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL ABOAGYE whose telephone number is (571)272-8165. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Ward can be reached on 571-272-1223. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Aboagye/
Assistant Examiner,
Art Unit 1793

/Jessica L. Ward/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793